ED 021 817 24 SP 001 591

By: Tyler, Ralph W.

REPORT OF THE POSTDOCTORAL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM OF THE CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES.

Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Science, Stanford, Calif.
Spons Agency: Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No: BR-6-1586
Pub Date: Aug 67
Grant: OEG-3-6-061586-0595
Note: 15p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.68
Descriptors: *BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, *COLLEGE FACULTY, *EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, INDIVIDUALIZED PROGRAMS, *INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *POST DOCTORAL EDUCATION
Identifiers: Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

Postdoctoral training programs at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences utilize the ongoing activities of the Center for broadening and deepening the educational research competence both of scholars in the field of education and behavioral scientists whose work can contribute significantly to more adequate understanding of educational problems. Of the 50 scholars and scientists participating in the program each year, 4 in 1965-66 and 5 in 1966-67 were supported by Office of Education fellowships. Three were research workers in education; 6 were behavioral scientists who were encouraged to undertake some initial work in educational research. The programs do not assign fellows to courses, tutorial instruction or apprentice activity; they focus, rather, on encouraging scholars to collaborate on studies that fully utilize concepts, methods, and insights of various relevant behavioral sciences. The function of the Center administration is to facilitate the work of each individual and of seminars and other working groups through providing space, equipment, library services, statistical advice, editorial services, research assistants, stenographic and duplicating services, and consultants as needed. The major portion of this report is a composite of statements by the 9 fellows providing descriptive and evaluative comments on their activities at the Center. (JS)

BR-6-1586
PA-24

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 6-1586- 24
Grant No. OEG-3-6-061586-0595

POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCH TRAINING PROJECT

August, 1967

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

SP001591
ED021817

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

REPORT OF THE POSTDOCTORAL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM OF THE CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Project No. 6-1586
Grant No. OEG 3-6-061586-0595

Ralph W. Tyler
August 25, 1967

Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
202 Junipero Serra Boulevard
Stanford, California 94305

Introduction

In some respects the postdoctoral educational research training program of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences is unique. It utilizes the ongoing activities of the Center as a milieu for broadening and deepening the educational research competence both of scholars in the field of education and behavioral scientists whose work can contribute significantly to a more adequate understanding of educational problems. Each year the Center brings fifty outstanding scholars and scientists, concerned with increasing knowledge about human behavior, to its campus where as postdoctoral Fellows they pursue studies of their own choosing, working both alone and with colleagues under conditions in which there is free exchange of ideas and intense mutual curiosity. Each Fellow is both a teacher and a learner.

Description of the Program

In 1965-66, funds of the Office of Education helped to support four of the fifty postdoctoral Fellows. They were Harold B. Dunkel, in the field of philosophy of education at the University of Chicago; O. J. Harvey, psychologist, University of Colorado; John L. Holland, psychologist, University of Iowa, and Research Director, American College Testing Program; and Martin Trow, sociologist, University of California, Berkeley. In 1966-67, funds of the Office of Education helped to support five of the fifty postdoctoral Fellows. They were Jules Henry, anthropologist, Washington University, St. Louis; Robert D. Hess, professor in the field of early childhood education at the University of Chicago; Nicholas Hobbs, psychologist, Peabody College, and Director of the Kennedy Center for Research in Child Development; Arthur P. Jensen, educational psychologist, University of California, Berkeley; and Winfred F. Hill, psychologist, Northwestern University.

The behavioral scientists were brought to the Center to gain an understanding of the possibilities of directing their research efforts to important problems in education, and were encouraged to undertake some initial work of this sort. They were aided by the research scholars at the Center who are already noted for their contributions to educational research. The research workers in education were brought to the Center to obtain a broader and deeper perspective and competence in educational research through the experience they gained in working with behavioral scientists in various disciplines.

This training program does not assign postdoctoral Fellows to courses, to tutorial instruction or to apprentice activity with senior scholars. Instead it is focused on the further development through collaborative efforts of highly competent scholars in directions that are likely to furnish more adequate educational research studies utilizing more fully the concepts, methods and insights of various relevant behavioral sciences. The function of the Center administration is to facilitate the work of each individual and of seminars and other working groups through providing space, equipment, library services, statistical advice, editorial services, research assistants, stenographic and duplicating services, and consultants as needed. Hence, a

description of the actual activities carried on during the year is an individual report. No two postdoctoral Fellows engage in precisely the same activities. The following section includes statements from each Fellow, providing both descriptive and evaluative comments.

Evaluation of the Program

The way in which a postdoctoral Fellow views the educational research training experience from the initial plans he has on through the changes that take place from his individual study and his work with others is well expressed in the following report of Winfred F. Hill, psychologist, Northwestern University, who was in residence at the Center in 1966-67:

"Although my research as a psychologist has been mainly of an empirical sort on learning and motivation in rats, I prefer to think of myself as a learning theorist rather than as a comparative psychologist. In that capacity I have always taken an interest in the applications of learning theory to personality development and related areas. I looked forward to my Fellowship at the Center as an opportunity to follow up this interest more than I have ever had the opportunity to do at home. What I needed for this purpose were a base of operations away from my responsibilities at Northwestern, a library, a typewriter, and time. All of these the Center provided very effectively, with many fringe benefits as well. The opportunity happened to come at a time when I was working on a general psychology text (a great educational experience for me), which made the breadth of contacts available at the Center especially welcome.

"I deliberately kept my goals for the Fellowship year broad and vague, wanting to see what new directions might emerge from my reading, thinking, and discussions. My activities in the first quarter of the Fellowship year were therefore quite diffuse. I read (or at least skimmed) extensively on topics as diverse as ethology, personality measurement, child-rearing, and self-actualization--as many books in three months as normally in three years. Though I currently have no need for computers in my research, I took Dave Peizer's computer course both as a contribution to my general education and with an eye to possible future uses. I followed up a minor interest in the relations between scientific and historical methods by attending two meetings of the historiography discussion group and writing a brief commentary on Jack Hexter's paper. I joined the seminar on development, led one session, and attended the others regularly. In fact, it seems to me that I took advantage of about every opportunity that the Center offered.

"I enjoyed this first quarter a lot, but by November (having arrived in August) was starting to feel uncomfortable about the lack of tangible production. At this point, therefore, I began to focus on the topic of greatest interest to me, the sources of complex human motives in relation to the simpler and presumably more basic motives that have traditionally figured in learning theory. This question gradually narrowed to the question of why positive and negative evaluations of a person function respectively as positive and negative reinforcers for him. Theoretical problems that had bothered me for years got

more precisely formulated, hypotheses emerged, and eventually a long theoretical article, "The Sources of Evaluative Reinforcement," went off to the Psychological Bulletin, where it has now been accepted for publication. The possible lines of research suggested by this article lead in many directions: experimental, psychometric, developmental, crosscultural. Though the possibility of following leads in a direction far removed from my previous research intrigued me, the thought of the methodological problems in relation to my own limited competence convinced me that such a radical change would not be wise. By the beginning of my final quarter, therefore, I felt pretty well committed to a line of animal experimentation that would build on my previous research but move in directions determined by the ideas in "The Sources of Evaluative Reinforcement." Only the details remained to be decided.

"Meanwhile, I had been plugging away at my textbook and had found several valuable connections between it and my contacts at the Center. The sections on individual differences profited from my contacts with Art Jensen, those on development and on language from the development seminar and the informal discussions that grew out of it, and those on motivation and personality from the related theoretical work I was doing. The motivation chapter of the book and the theoretical implications of my research plans combined to inspire a good deal of thinking about the general theory of motivation and such specific related topics as avoidance learning and frustration. Though this thinking was helpful in organizing and clarifying my ideas, I am disappointed to report that the only tangible product was a theoretical note which is currently under editorial review. I did, however, develop some plans both for my current research grant and for a projected future one growing out of "The Sources of Evaluative Reinforcement." To complete the list of tangible products of the year, I did some part of the work for three potential primary-data articles at the Center: one now in print, one likely to be published eventually, and one for which the results proved so disappointing that it never reached even the stage of a finished manuscript. Thus my work at the Center made some contribution to one book and four articles that either have been or hopefully will be published, while my thinking here has led to some change, though not as large a one as I had considered, in my plans for future research.

"Prior to my arrival, I had expected that among my contacts with other Fellows, the most profitable would be with those interested in applying learning theory to child development, such as Justin Aronfreed and Bob Singer. However, our current interests did not overlap as much as I had thought they might. On my main project I worked pretty much alone. Some of my most profitable contacts were in tangential areas that I knew less about to start with, such as individual differences (Art Jensen, Julian Stanley) and language (Dave Olmsted, Tom Sebeok). Probably my single most interesting contact among the Fellows was with Art Jensen, whose ideas on the nature-nurture issue proved exceptionally stimulating. As for my having stimulated others, it is of course harder to judge. I hope that I may have served as a useful sounding board (or possibly gadfly) for some of the Fellows I have mentioned and one or two others. So far as influencing Fellows in directions of my own is concerned, I suspect that my influence has been quite small.

"All that I required from the statistical laboratory were occasioral use of a calculator and someone to do a little hackwork, both of which I obtained with no trouble. Beyond that, my contacts with the statistical facilities of the Center were general-intellectual rather than practical. In this respect I found the computer class, the discussion session on the Coleman report, and my informal contacts with Dave Peizer all valuable, and hope he will continue to provide this sort of intellectual stimulation at the Center. On the other hand, if he had offered any more classes or didactic discussions, I would have had to make painful decisions between taking advantage of them and sticking to my other work, so I do not necessarily recommend that his program be expanded."

John L. Holland, psychologist, University of Iowa and Research Director, American College Testing Program, describes his activities and estimates their effects more succinctly. He was in residence during 1965-66. He writes:

"I think now I was more fortunate than most fellows, for I did not bring to the Center a specific project I had to do, or at least I was prevented from doing such a project until June. Equally important, I found no fellows whose interests closely resembled mine. As a result, I had no ready made group that I belonged to, nor project task master. I must confess that initially I felt a little abused by this situation, but I gradually assumed the attitude that I should use other fellows as resource persons to ask questions of, to seek out for advice on reading, and to get criticism from. The outcome was that I spent the year getting reoriented by informal conversations with many fellows-most of whom had only peripheral interest in my special interests.

"The outcomes that I can report consist of some reorientations within my special interests, a substantial gain in self-confidence due primarily to tutoring by Alston in the philosophy of science. Other fellows--Harvey, Caspari, Bevan, Etzioni, Crews, Husen, Adams, Stein, Watson, and Lidz--also provided me with a great variety of tutoring, criticism, support, and fun. It is difficult to distill what happened, but I miss their companionship . . .

"The tangible results of my year include the following:

1) finishing a book,
2) writing or coauthoring five or six research reports,
3) some new research goals and ideas,
4) a lessened interest in publishing and an increased interest in doing a better research job,
5) a better knowledge of educational research,
6) a clearer idea of where I have been and where I ought to go,
7) increased self-confidence,
8) a simple but important insight--'motivation is more important than unlimited amounts of time,'
9) a family that seems happier and more mature."

Another postdoctoral Fellow in 1965-66, Martin Trow, sociologist, University of California, Berkeley, described his program of activities and the consequences as follows:

"I came to the Center with a certain amount of data in hand for analysis in connection with two different studies. One of these is a study of the university teachers of Great Britain; part of that study is based on a large amount of survey data collected by ourselves and by a British Royal Commission. During my residence at the Center, I organized these data for analysis; and drafted three chapters toward the eventual book. I also am working on a joint study of the impact of education in eight American colleges and universities and while in residence at the Center, drafted two additional chapters for that volume.

"In addition, I wrote an essay for a conference on the improvement of teaching of the social sciences. This essay is being published by the American Council on Education and will also appear in a British Journal.

"During the year, I worked with ten Fellows in organizing a seminar on the relation of social science to public policy. These Fellows were: Higham, historian, University of Michigan; Bicanic, Jugoslav economist; Polsby, Wesleyan political scientist; Bevan, psychologist, Kansas State University; Mandelbaum, historian, University of Pennsylvania; Stanley, educational psychologist, University of Wisconsin; Schorske, historian, University of California, Berkeley; Watson, political scientist, University of Missouri, Stein, CED economist; Harsanyi, economist, University of California, Berkeley. For my own contribution to the seminar, I wrote an informal paper on some aspects of British policy on higher education. The stimulation of writing this paper for an interested and critical group led me to extend my reading and thinking in the subject. I have since considerably revised and extended the paper, going more deeply especially into British policy on higher technical and scientific education. I find this subject now extremely significant both for understanding British education and society, and also for its comparative perspectives. It is likely that my next major line of research and study will be in that direction, growing directly out of this seminar at the Center.

"I had continuous informal conversations with a number of the Fellows during the year. Perhaps the most frequent were with Torsten Husen, with whom I share a great many interests centering on comparative education, educational opportunity, and national education policy. I learned a great deal from him about Swedish, and more generally, European education, especially at the elementary and secondary levels. We exchanged manuscripts and commented on each other's recent and current work. One result is that I have a stronger interest in developments in Swedish education than I had; one immediate result is that at his invitation, I will be giving lectures at the Universities of Stockholm and Uppsala this autumn.

"I also had very many useful (and pleasant) discussions with other Fellows interested in education. Julian Stanley shares an interest in the impact of higher education, and we exchanged papers and discussed them frequently. I spoke quite often with John Holland, both about vocational guidance and prediction, which links with my interest on the relation of education and the occupational structure, and about the problems of large scale educational research. I talked with Nate Gage a few times, but look forward to seeing more of him, since we are neighbors in the Bay Area.

"Nelson Polsby and I have many common interests, and I saw a great deal of him during the year. I found his critical and sympathetic interest in my struggles with some survey data extremely helpful at times. I also remember with pleasure many informal conversations over the lunch table with Stanley Hoffman, John Higham and Rudi Bicanic. I have a special interest in Yugoslav universities, and Bicanic taught me a great deal about the contemporary intellectual climate in Yugoslavia. Among others I spoke with more occasionally are Bob Uhlenbeck (on Dutch university organization and policy), and John Higham on various subjects, including national policy in the arts on which he was writing. Ironically, I only came to really know my Berkeley colleague, Carl Schurske, at the Center, and had several long talks with him about Berkeley and innovations in higher education generally. I will certainly be continuing my association with Schorske in Berkeley.

"It is difficult to assess in any objective way the year at the Center just as it ends. Nevertheless, I will try to say something about why I feel the year has been enormously profitable to me.

"First, it was a chance to do work relatively free from distraction. Distraction, the multiplicity of demands, unrelated jobs and activities, are the curse of academic life, at least in the graduate departments of major universities. The great relief of the Center year is not so much from teaching as it is freedom from the ancillary functions of administration, committee work, counselling and so forth, that disrupt and atomize one's working time in most universities. The Center creates something very near to the ideal conditions for reflection and scholarship. It is ironic and disturbing that those conditions today can apparently only be created <u>outside</u> a university. But, nevertheless, having experienced those conditions, and the very real pleasures of working under those conditions, I mean to approximate them as closely as I can in my home university.

"The other major reward of my Fellowship was the rare opportunity for casual and continued association with scholars whose work is near to but outside my own discipline. This is perhaps of greater importance for a member of a large university department than for a scholar working in a small liberal arts college. But my own experience at Berkeley, in a department of 25-30 members, is that my intellectual conversation goes on almost completely within my own department, and with a few others who share my interests in education. This is not especially by choice; my interests are broad, and I would be happy to talk more often to historians, political scientists, and philosophers. But that simply takes an effort, on both sides, which we rarely make. It is significant that of the other three Fellows during 1965-1966 from Berkeley, Shurske, Crews, and Adams, I had casually met Schorske and Crews at Berkeley, but had never had a genuine conversation with any of them.

"I should mention also the cheerful efficiency of the secretarial and other services at the Center. Manuscripts and letters were typed quickly and accurately, books were rapidly made available, and I had the useful aid of the Xeroxing machine. This was part of the freedom from distraction which I mentioned as the most important single virtue of the Center for me."

The way in which Arthur R. Jensen, educational psychologist, University of California, Berkeley, utilized his fellowship year and his comments on the results are presented in the following statement of his:

"My activities during my year at CASBS can be grouped into two main categories: Study and Writing.

"Study

"For the past several years I have been interested in behavioral genetics but have never had the time to take up a serious study of the subject. My main study objective for this past year at CASBS has been to increase my understanding of genetics, particularly as it relates to the inheritance of mental abilities. I believe there has been no one year period in my career since my college days during which I have learned as much about a particular subject as I have learned about genetics during this past year. I regard this as a major addition to my education, my career and my professional competence. The Center provided not only the time, library facilities, and freedom to make this possible, but also made possible interaction with others with related interests and with a greater background than my own in genetics. When I ran into difficulties in my reading I was able to consult the behavior geneticist (McBride) who was also a Fellow during this year. Discussions with our statistician, David Peizer, have been extensive and extremely helpful; in many cases we worked out certain problems in quantitative genetics together; he helped me many times with certain mathematical and statistical problems.

"As a result of my study, correspondence, and writing, I have become acquainted with other persons around the country in the field of behavior genetics. I am now in close touch with researchers in several institutions where important investigations in human behavior genetics are being conducted.

"Writing

"The Center has given me the time and secretarial facilities to do a considerable amount of writing. I have written between 500 and 600 pages this year; most of it is part of a book I am doing on biological and cultural determinants of individual differences in educability. Some 200 pages of the book deals with the genetic basis of individual differences.

"In addition to writing my own book, I have edited a book (with M. Deutsch and I. Katz) entitled "Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development", now in press (Holt, Rinehart and Winston). I contributed a chapter to the book and wrote various introductions to other chapters.

"Other articles, books, chapters, etc. written this year are listed on the following page. In addition, I gave four out-of-town talks this year: An invited address at AERA, a paper at the National Academy of Sciences, an address at a conference on Psychological Aspects of Poverty (U.Wisconsin), and a lecture in the Psychology Dept. Colloquium Series at San Diego State College."

WRITINGS DURING 1966-67 AT CASDS

By Arthur R. Jensen

1. Review of D. H. Stott's "Studies of Troublesome Children" Contemp. Psychol. in press.

2. Report to State Department of Education Commission on the Education of the culturally Disadvantaged in California (with A. B. Wilson and D. Elliott).

3. Social Class, Race, and Genetics: Implications for Education. Amer. Educ. Res. J., in press.

4. The Culturally Disadvantaged: Psychological and Educational Aspects. Educ. Res., in press.

5. The Culturally Disadvantaged and the Heredity-Environment Uncertainty. In J. Hellmuth (Ed). The Culturally Disadvantaged Child (Vol. II) Seattle, Wash.,: Special Child Publications, in press.

6. Learning Ability, Intelligence, and Educability. In V. Allen (Ed.) Psychological Aspects of Poverty, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, in press.

7. Estimation of the Limits of Heritability from Comparisons of MZ and DZ Twins. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., 1967, 58, 149-156.

8. Social Class and Verbal Learning. In M. Deutsch, A. R. Jensen, and I. Katz (Eds.) Race, Social Class, and Psychological Development, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, in press.

9. Mental Retardation, Mental Age, and Learning Rate (with W. D. Rohwer, Jr.) Science (submitted for publication).

In each year one or two of the postdoctoral Fellows concentrate their study upon one major task utilizing the resources of the Center and the comments and advice of other Fellows to aid in this focused activity. Harold B. Dunkel, professor in the field of philosophy of education, University of Chicago, who was in residence at the Center in 1965-66, represents this kind of Fellowship activity. He writes:

"My chief and essentially sole activity has been to produce a book on Herbart and Herbartianism. Many years ago I became intrigued by the odd pattern of Herbart's fame and influence: (1) little fame and even less influence at the time of his death in 1841; (2) triumphant revival of his work twenty-five years later by Ziller, who developed Herbartianism into an international movement; (3) Herbartianism's later migration to America in 1899; (4) the abrupt end of the movement about 1905, with Herbart sinking into almost complete oblivion.

"Since Herbart was a philosopher, I had originally seen the study as illuminating the role of philosophy in an educational movement and I had thought that there might be some 'morals' lurking in the story for the present operation in philosophy of education and its relations to curriculum. That is not the way things worked out, partly because there was even less Herbart in Herbartianism than Dewey in Deweyism, and the study became an investigation of historical forces rather than one of the adventures of ideas in the educational world--though some of that remains, of course. In any event, the story is still fascinating in my opinion--a fact of which I hope to convince my readers."

O. J. Harvey, psychologist, University of Colorado, was another postdoctoral Fellow who focused his activities sharply while in residence in 1965-66. He writes very succinctly:

"I came to the Center with a considerable collection of data from 'Head Start' centers and hoped that my thinking about these data as I analyzed them and my conversations with psychologists and educators would change my set and my conceptualization of these old problems of intellectual development and would generate some new issues. This, I feel I accomplished, although I am sure that only with time will the importance of this experience to my research and writing become apparent."

Jules Henry, anthropologist, Washington University, St. Louis, was one of the postdoctoral Fellows in 1966-67 who concentrated his activities into one major task. This is illustrated by the following comments he made toward the end of the year:

"I came to the Center intending to finish my book on the families of psychotic children. These are families with which I spent a week at a time, sometimes living in, sometimes arriving around breakfast time and leaving when the family retired. I finished the book and Random House will bring it out in the Spring of 1968. During my fellowship period I had the opportunity to talk over some of the problems encountered in these families with the psychiatrist fellows: but stimulation was

received from psychologists and linguists too. Another very important feature of the Center is its position in the Bay Area and the fact that interested organizations and people like to invite the Fellows to give talks. These talks are stimulating experiences too. I discussed my work at seminars, meetings, etc. in the following places: Stanford School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry; Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute; Mt. Zion Medical Center; Presbyterian Medical Center; Northern California Psychiatric Association; Mental Research Institute; San Mateo County Mental Health Association."

Robert D. Hess, Director of the Urban Child Center, University of Chicago, organized his study activities at the Center around two major problem areas. His central interest is: "in the input side of social learning--the processes through which children are inducted into social and cognitive patterns of behavior in society. At the moment, this interest takes the form of research and writing on the effects of maternal behavior upon cognitive development in young, urban children, with particular focus upon early learning in urban Negro families (so called disadvantaged or deprived, etc.). This is the nature of my interest in education--the impact of social and cultural experience upon learning and academic achievement. The Urban Child Center at the University of Chicago is involved with units at several other universities in research in this general area. Related to this is a project intended to assess the behavior of classroom teachers in terms of cognitive input and achievement outcomes of children in the class.

"I am also studying the socialization of children into political and compliance systems. One major study of political socialization, which I conducted with Professor David Easton, has been reported to the U.S. Office of Education, which sponsored the project, and is to appear as a book in winter or spring, 1967. An outgrowth of this interest is a cross-national study of the socialization of children into compliance systems, by which I mean the authority figures, rules, and laws of the major systems encountered by children: family, school, community, and nation. This study includes children from the U.S., Denmark, Italy, Greece, India, and Japan. This is part of a preoccupation with the techniques and processes by which children acquire patterns of behavior that relate them to the major systems of the society--political, educational, religious, medical, legal, economic."

During his residence at the Center, Hess worked on a manuscript dealing with maternal influences upon cognitive development and also wrote up a report on the data he had obtained from the cross-national study on socialization of compliance. He also was active in a seminar group on social factors in development and education where he presented informal memoranda on the school as an instrument of socialization.

He wrote at the end of his fellowship: "This year at the Center I have been able to pursue these major interests in two ways that would not have been easily possible at my home university. I have discussed the theoretical issues with my colleagues in an informal seminar, and I have been able to extend my reading of related materials."

Nicholas Hobbs, psychologist, Peabody College, and Director of the Kennedy Center for Research in Child Development, commented on the activities he carried on in 1966-67 that he felt had provided him with an invaluable experience and which he expects to increase his research competence substantially in the years ahead. He wrote in June, 1967:

"1) I have brought to about 80 per cent of completion a book on Project Re-ED, an NIMH supported pilot project to develop a new kind of residential school for emotionally disturbed children. The project is nearing its eighth and final year of operation. We think it has been quite successful in demonstrating that carefully selected and briefly trained young teachers can be remarkably effective in working with moderately to severely disturbed children, and that arrangements can be made for extending the effectiveness of scarce and expensive mental health manpower by using them as consultants to the teachers. The concepts developed in the Project are already spreading, a process that should be speeded by our book.

"2) I have read widely in an effort to get caught up on some of the main intellectual currents of our time and specifically to prepare for a new position as Provost of Vanderbilt University and Director of the Kennedy Center at Peabody College. This process itself has been immediately and richly rewarding although I surmise it will be years before I know the full return on this pleasant investment.

"3) I have taken advantage of our location near Stanford to study in some depth a famous institution with some of the same problems which face Vanderbilt. I have had conferences with the Provost, the Assistant Provost, the Director of Planning, the Director of the University Press, the Director of the Computer Center, the Director of the Hoover Institute, the Dean of the School of Business, and the Dean of the College of Arts and Science. These have been both delightful and informative encounters.

"4) With the help of a tutor, and lessons once or twice a week, I have brought my French back up to useable form in reading, writing, and speaking. I anticipate a rapid expansion, after Vietnam, of our national investment in international education and believe that competence in a second language will be helpful.

"5) While I have sharply curtailed travel and sundry professional activities, I have continued my involvement with the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, have served on a presidential task force on children, and have made about a half dozen speeches as part of my obligation to the local community.

"6) Finally, I have greatly enjoyed the friendship and stimulation of my colleagues at the Center. This may well turn out to be the most important part of the experience."

The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences has been operating now for thirteen years. This has furnished sufficient time to have developed a very effective system for identifying postdoctoral Fellows, for selecting the most able ones and for organizing the Center's resources in ways that easily facilitate a program that emphasizes individual freedom to choose study activities and to pursue them in terms of the individual styles, while at the same time, assuring each postdoctoral Fellow many opportunities for communication with other persons coming from different places and different disciplines who are concerned with similar problems. During the past two years with the aid of financial support from the Office of Education, we have been able to extend this kind of postdoctoral research training to outstanding scholars concerned with education. We expect that the future publications of these Fellows will provide more valid and objective evidence of the significance of this training for them.

The financial report is also enclosed. We are deeply grateful for the contribution of the Office of Education to this project.

98-30

FINAL REPORT

POSTDOCTORAL TRAINING IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Project #6-1586

Grant # OEG 3-6-061586-0595 PL
August 31, 1967

	Expenditures Budgeted	Actual
Stipends	$75,000.00	$79,091.40
Travel	3,000.00	3,499.37
Retirement	7,500.00	3,392.92
Institutional Allowance	5,000.00	4,516.31
	$90,500.00	$90,500.00

Grant Funds Received:

May 23, 1966	$12,000.00	
September 14, 1966	23,150.00	
December 19, 1966	23,150.00	
March 13, 1967	23,150.00	
Total received to date		$81,450.00
Expenditures per detail		(90,500.00)
Grant fund due		9,050.00